

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of the subject patent application in view of the RCE submitted herewith and in view of the present Amendment and the following Remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 28-48 are pending. Claims 28, 29, 32-35, 37-45, 47, and 48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil (U.S. Pat. No. 6,134,318) in view of Sequeira (U.S. Pat. No. 6,222,530) and further in view of Sundaresan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,289,369). Claims 36, and 46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil, Sequeira, Sundaresan and Cota-Robles (U.S. Pat. No. 6,658,447). Claim 31 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil, Sequeira, and Sundaresan further in view of Chang (U.S. Pat. No. 6,314,430). Claims 28-30, 37, 47, and 48 have been amended. After careful review of the claims and references, it is believed that the claims are in allowable form and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 28, 29, 32-35, 37-45, and 47-48 have been rejected as being obvious over O'Neil in view Sequeira and Sundaresan. Independent claim 28, 37, 47 and 48 call for identifying a processor affinity and assigning the thread to a processor within the multiprocessor system according to the affinity. Claims 28 and 37 have also been amended to assign workflow and task priorities to distribute the task objects wherein the workflow priority, if assigned, is predominant (see e.g., p. 19, lines 12-20; p. 23). The Office Action indicates that the claimed queuing the task objects in a task object queue is disclosed by O'Neil by its description of call queuing at Col. 11, line 43. However, in O'Neil it is the call request that is queued not a task object (Col. 11, lines 49-50). The Office Action also indicates that the claimed distributing the task from the

task queue to an available thread based on priority is described by O'Neil at Col. 7, lines 8-15, Col. 10, line 65-Col. 11, line 12 and Col. 12, line 48 to Col. 13, ln 3. However, the Col. 7 passages describe call queuing but not assigning to a thread; Col. 10, line 65-Col. 11, line 12, and Col. 12, line 48-Col 13, line 3 describe a call thread which is initiated when a call is initiated (Col. 10, lines 66-67) and which selects the queue for the call (Col. 11, lines 1-2). Thus, O'Neil does not describe distributing the task object from a task queue to a thread because O'Neil's thread queues the call, it does not distribute it from a queue to the thread.

The Office Action also concedes that O'Neil does not disclose a thread pool but asserts that Sequeira teaches a thread pool at Col. 5, line 46-Col. 6, line 6, and Col. 9, lines 16-31. However, Sequeira at Col. 5-6 does not describe a threshold pool at all, and at Col. 9 teaches assigning a task to a thread and then putting the thread attached to a task into a pool. Thus, it is not a pool of available threads but rather is a pool of already assigned threads. The Office Action also asserts that Sundaresan teaches identifying a processor affinity and assigning the thread to a processor. However, Sundaresan does not describe a processor affinity attributed to the task objects but rather describes affinity i.d.'s assigned to the threads. Thus each thread has a thread affinity i.d. assigned to it, but there is no disclosure of assigning a processor affinity to task objects. Thus, these claimed features are not described in the cited references, and therefore the independent claims 28, 37, 47 and 48 are distinguishable over O'Neil, Sequeira, and Sundaresan. In addition, claims 29-36 and 38-46 are dependent upon independent claims 28, and 37, and are therefore distinguishable over the cited

references for the same reasons. Further, the claims 28-46 now call for a workflow priority and task priority based on workflow priority if assigned and otherwise based on event priority. This feature is not disclosed in any of the cited references. Thus, claims 28-46 are believed to be further distinguishable for this reason.


In addition, claim 30 has been amended to be directed to event priority based on event content and event types (see p. 22, lines 2-4), and claim 47 has been amended to be directed to subsystem and event identifiers and identifying workflow based thereon (see p. 18). Each of these features is not disclosed in the cited references and therefore they are believed to be further distinguishable for these reasons.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits an early Notice of Allowance. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Primary Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By: 
James A. Scheer
Registration No. 29,434

November 29, 2007

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500